

institutions have been slowly built by trial and error, pain, sweat, and sacrifice and should not be petulantly discarded. Room for improvement they all have, if improvement is the genuine objective.

A second basis for judging whether to take part is whether the decision is made thoughtfully or whether it is the product of emotion. Group emotions quickly intensify and what passes for a reason in the midst of shared anger, resentment, or other strong passions, too often turns up as regrettable stupidity later. No one who has not witnessed a mob can fully comprehend its inhuman acts and caprices. I was in college when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. For some unaccountable reason the students on campus kindled a huge bonfire on the terrace of one of the dormitories and fed it with their furniture, their clothes, their books, and their class notes. It was a pagan, subhuman spectacle, spontaneous and performed by generally sensible students. It can happen.

Finally, and this is undoubtedly the most critical question, will the proposed undertaking actually serve the ends claimed for it? Everyone can respond warmly to a rallying cry of "peace," or "freedom," and consequently the rascals of the day chant the magic words even louder and more fervently than the saints. Since both goals are as difficult to attain as they are desirable, progress toward them is seldom achieved by hasty or superficial techniques. Indeed, if freedom is a condition of unrestricted opportunity which derives from mutual trust, one of the few sure consequences of the Berkeley uprising is a substantial setback in the condition from which freedom springs, mutual trust. As Leo Rosten has stated, "We must learn to meet fanaticism with courage, and idealism with great care, for we must be skeptical of what is promised, even by virtuous men, but has not been proved."

On the students' part, we must hope that as they exert their power, they will do so toward thoughtfully conceived, constructive goals. What of the faculty and administrative roles in the new circumstances? What changes must take place in what the students perceive as "The Establishment"?

First, there is a more pressing obligation than before to provide the clear channels through which students may raise questions, express dissatisfaction, propose change and, in return, hear from and interact directly with those who make policy. The people who are ultimately responsible for any organization do themselves no favor by interposing echelons of agents between themselves and their constituencies. The shape and dimensions of any substantial grievance cannot fail to be distorted when processed according to the perception and the reporting of third parties. In any argument with headquarters, students already perceiving themselves as under-dogs, are confirmed in that perception when the bone of contention is carried away to a remote adversary.

A second requirement relates to the attitude of the policymakers toward students who are seeking help, clarification or redress. A cavalier reception of petitioners is one of the most effective means of escalating a minor difficulty into a full-scale battle. Vice President HUMPHREY, either mispoke or mis-thought when he said on August 23, "What I wish to suggest is that we in the United States have created a society in which freedom and equality are meaningful concepts—not vague abstractions. But I must also say that the right to be heard does not automatically include the right to be taken seriously. The latter depends entirely upon what is being said."

As the administration of any democratic community fails to take seriously the claims or the complaints of its people, it makes a critical error, for it has by that failure revealed that it either does not honor or else

does not understand democracy, and it has added to whatever real or imagined problem existed originally an obvious injury which an unscrupulous leader can readily exploit.

This much of what is required of academic leadership is fairly obvious and can be passed over quickly. The other point I would make suggests a marked departure from general practice and needs some elaboration and defense. It is briefly that college policies ought to be the product of carefully arrived at value judgments which the institution has made consciously, is prepared to proclaim proudly, defend publicly, and alter or abandon with good grace if proven ill-founded. Since value judgments are at the other end of the scale from the dispassionate and never-ending search for truth which is the stock-in-trade of the academic institution, college and university officials may understandably place the enforcement of regulations as many steps removed as possible from the policymakers in the hope that no one will perceive a relationship between the two. In this act of camouflage, they are hoist by their own petard.

The Berkeley thing was started by an administrative decision to enforce a ban against a certain type of political activity by students. The specific infraction was the manning of a table where political action groups were making known their causes. A dean charged with enforcing such a regulation can hardly enlist enthusiastic compliance if his ammunition is restricted to the assertion that an act is against the rules. In this instance, some students suspected that the abrupt enforcement of a dormant rule was the result of pressures by the Oakland Tribune or other powerful, noncampus influences. The voicing of such suspicion helped attract many defenders of academic freedom and amalgamated the most diverse elements in an attack upon a craven administration.

Whatever the cause for the change in policy from nonenforcement to enforcement, it must have reflected some responsible authority's judgment, that is, value judgment, that it was wrong for the students to continue what they were doing. Such a judgment should not have been made unless it was explainable, defensible, and consistent with other policies that relate to the same judgment. A university through its regulations commits itself to the propriety or impropriety of certain actions and if it is unwilling to acknowledge its regulative brain-child and nurture and defend it, then perhaps students are correct in assuming that the offspring is illegitimate, sired outside the family.

The open mind is one of the fundamental necessities of a democracy, but if it is open at both ends and there is no thought process in the middle, it is no mind at all. It is simply a conduit.

If the trustees and faculties and administrators of our centers of learning persist in the belief that the *sine qua non* of such institutions is a collective open mind of the conduit type, then their campuses will attract growing numbers of malefactors whose purpose is to hobble and disrupt and whose harvest of destruction will increase as they discover there are no limits to what can be undertaken under banners of free speech and civil disobedience. In a recent article Dr. Buell Gallagher, president of the City College of New York, reporting on the Berkeley events, stated, "(The students) were in no mood to talk things over or to compromise. The time for action had come. They no longer respectfully requested, they demanded. And when demands were not met, they used the well-learned tactics of civil disobedience to bring the academic process to a grinding halt. 'We shall see who runs this university,' shouted the student leader, Mario Savio. Thus did the defense of rights become a naked struggle for power * * *."

Abe Raskin comments: "the reckless prodigality with which the free speech movement uses the weapon of civil disobedience raises problems no university can deal with adequately."

Since communism has rendered truth a relative, if not a completely meaningless word, and since civil disobedience seems to be regarded within the acceptable or even desirable range of academic conduct, it appears that colleges and universities are going to be forced to make some value judgments and establish and enforce certain limits of conduct, or face the eternal prospect of defending themselves from internal attacks by anyone with an ax to grind.

As these remarks have developed, this has been a backward entrance on stage by a character that deserves a center-stage fanfare. The change from a self-conscious institutional neutrality to a forceful, intentional partisanship should not be the result of a belated effort to improve a strategic position in dealing with fractious students. It should, instead, spring from a confident, albeit humble recognition that the central mission of education is to elevate society, and that the educational institution cannot fulfill that role from the position of apologetic neutrality.

In recent times a great deal of attention has been paid to extremism or fanaticism and the impropriety in a pluralistic society of placing any one objective above all others. Perhaps we are now seeing in the campus uprising the predictable results of the extremist attachment of the academic community to the open mind. There are, however, beginning to be some notable deviations from that rigid attachment. Professors are increasingly abandoning the dispassionate pose and moving out into the public marketplace of ideas to press the causes of their personal value judgments. Perhaps the best-known instance in which academic men are trying to influence the public mind is found in that group of professors at Michigan and elsewhere who have engaged in the teach-in movement to encourage our Government to withdraw from the Vietnam conflict. It makes no difference whether you and I agree or disagree with them, their action illustrates the point of scholars who are propounding value judgments.

Perhaps the time has come when our institutions of higher learning, faced with the necessity to protect themselves from irresponsible attacks, will have the courage to transcend mere defensive regulations and assert themselves as positive forces in the battle for men's minds. There are certain areas of commitment shared by men of good will which could be codified as institutional objectives. They might well include an insistence upon responsible behavior and upon respect for the individual, and a rejection of racial or religious discrimination. Once over the hurdle of the traditional and almost psychotic avoidance of anything that could be interpreted as a value judgment, it is possible that colleges and universities might reassert themselves in the role they once occupied of proponents of ethical and moral living.

Education is, after all, supposed to be a service to society. If the institutions of higher learning are by default, or even by active encouragement contributing to unethical and immoral behavior, it is a strange service they are performing for society.

This is a hazardous change of course to propose for higher education. The hazards lie in the choice of those human objectives to which the institution commits itself and also in the techniques by which it chooses to advance them. But any institutional move in this direction would certainly meet such internal resistance that there is little danger of precipitate action. There is an even more effective safeguard against any

national trust into mass indoctrination. That safeguard is the large number of colleges and universities and the diversity of their control. Each has its own policy board its own faculty committees, its own executive officers. If one institution through its faculty, trustees and administration concluded that slovenliness and bad manners were not necessary to the highest intellectual endeavor and in fact were antithetical to that end, and if it declared its institutional self in behalf of such a value judgment, there is no reason to fear that all others would follow suit.

I would propose here one objective for all colleges and universities—a conscious and determined effort to prepare their students for a world which has always been and always will be beset with monumental problems and imminent dangers, but a world that has also been blessed with a sequence of heroic figures who defied pessimism and proved of themselves that man can work prodigies. Mankind has always needed its heroes and with the mechanical devices we have to apprise us immediately of the full details of every world catastrophe, we need our heroes now more than ever before. The sad part is that there are enough scholars at work to unearth the human foibles and peculiar failings of each entry in the lexicon of the great, with the result that one may suspect greatness is merely a coincidence of good luck and skillful public relations.

College students and all people, but especially college students, need a periodic encounter with the vibrant, dedicated, optimistic, magnificent accomplishers of our times, whose works and temper place them beyond any suspicion of self-serving or petty motives. There are such individuals, people who make those around them stand taller just by the power and the genuineness of their commitment. On our campus, we have experienced this confident aura in Dr. Connie Gulon, Dean Myron Tribus, Gwendolyn Brooks, Walter Judd—or you write your own list.

The first 11 articles of the March issue of the Atlantic were devoted to Winston Churchill. Editor Edward Weeks began his introductory statement by saying, "Anyone who ever saw Winston Churchill in action will never forget it." And concluded, "This, then, is the Atlantic's expression of gratitude for the greatest man of our age." In the Saturday Review, Norman Cousins' editorial said in part, "Several times during the 20th century—most notably following the deaths of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Mahatma Gandhi, John F. Kennedy, Jawaharlal Nehru, Pope John XXIII—there have been worldwide demonstrations of loss deeply felt. What is most significant about the response to Churchill's death is the reflection in it of the changes he created in the people he reached. In speaking to the strength inside people, he caused that strength to come into being."

Our educational institutions are, after all, working with the future leaders of the Nation. It is not our obligation to stretch their aspirations, fortify their courage and challenge them to rise toward their own possibilities of dignity and power? And to do these things intentionally?

It would be a colossal irony if Mario Savio and his Free Speech Movement were the agents for proving to our colleges and universities that their total commitment to unhampered freedom in the search for truth is an untenable position. It would be a great service if Mario and the Free Speech Movement proved to students the necessity for responding thoughtfully to the urgings of each self-styled messiah. And it might be the dawn of a new era for the Nation if the California student leaders prompted a recognition by faculties, trustees, and administrators that they cannot conduct an educational institution without some value judg-

ments, and therefore they might as well extend themselves and make some value judgments that will amount to something.

In closing these remarks I want to include a quotation I have used before, repeating it now both because it bears repeating and also as a tribute to the man who wrote it, Albert Schweitzer. It occurs in a volume bearing the significant title, "The Light Within Us." "The final decisions as to what the future of a society shall be depends not on how near its organization is to perfection, but on the degrees of worthiness in its individual members."

It is time we recognized that college education has a direct bearing on the worthiness of the members of our society and labored earnestly and humbly and forthrightly to add to that worthiness according to our lights.

AWARD FOR HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois Optometric Association is having its annual meeting today in Chicago. The association will present three awards for outstanding service in the field of health. One will be to the optometrist of the year; one to an outstanding lay person, and a third to a distinguished public official.

Our own colleague, BILL SPRINGER, of the 22d Congressional District, has been chosen by the association to receive its distinguished public official award and I know that all of the Members of the House join me in congratulating him on being singled out for this honor.

BILL has been the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during the last year and has contributed substantially to constructive portions of much of the health legislation that has come from that committee this year. This award goes annually to only one public official in the State of Illinois. Because of the hard work which BILL SPRINGER has given to health legislation in this last year, I know that this award is well deserved and am sure that we are all pleased that the association is publicly recognizing his effort.

ACTION OF UNITED STATES IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC CRISIS

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, last April the United States sent soldiers and marines to the Dominican Republic to prevent a Communist takeover and creation of another Cuba. This action, predictably, set off sharp controversy both at home and abroad.

The argument flared again, in mid-September, in the other body, when one Senator, denouncing our actions, said:

Our intervention in Santo Domingo shook, if it did not shatter, a confidence in the United States that had been built up over 24 years.

However, another Senator, with whose conclusions I heartily agree in this mat-

ter, defended our intervention, pointing out that it was an unavoidable necessity and went on to observe that many critics of our Dominican policy "are not pro-Communist. But they are so bemused by the Communist pretension to social revolution, that they permit their tolerance of communism to blind them to the very real danger it poses to the survival of freedom."

It seems to me that we should have learned after so many years that the Communist Party is not just another political organization which may be dealt with around a conference table. But have we learned? From a look at the situation in the Dominican Republic today, I am inclined to doubt it.

The United States is deeply involved with the political, military and economic problems of the Dominican Republic. If American troops were to be withdrawn, there is little doubt that fighting would break out again; if American aid money were not forthcoming, the economy would collapse; if American support did not bolster the present government headed by Hector Garcia Godoy, set up in September under a compromise arranged by the Organization of American States, there would be political chaos.

Our officials admit that the Dominican problem is one of the most complex ever tackled. I have grave doubts, though, that some of the actions of the Garcia Godoy administration, supported by the United States, will go very far toward solving the matter.

Garcia Godoy, with U.S. approval, has taken a firm stand against Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, who led the fight against a Communist takeover before we intervened last April. Under conditions that can only be described as puzzling, to say the least, General Wessin has been deported from his country and he has charged the United States expelled him "with a bayonet at my back." I do not claim perfection for General Wessin, but there is certainly no honor due us for our role in throwing him out of his country.

The Dominican Government, with apparent U.S. consent, seeks to operate on the assumption that, by giving some former rebels good Government jobs, they can be rehabilitated. There are both Communist and non-Communist forces in the rebel camp, and there is always the possibility of open conflict between them. Dominican and U.S. strategy seems to be "divide and conquer" and weaken the rebel forces, which admittedly are made up of a number of splinter groups.

However, these conditions are also conducive to Communist consolidation of power among the rebels. The Communists, too, know how to divide and conquer, and they have operated on this principle for many years. Their abilities in using this strategy cannot be ignored; we would do so only at our peril. There can be no doubt about the skills available to the Communists in the Dominican Republic, either; it is known that Cuban-trained Communists are operating there and have been active since the first of the fighting.

October 13, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

25955

For reasons that are obscure to me, we chose to turn our attention to the Dominican rightwing first, when it seems the most logical course would have been to move against and destroy what Communist power and influence existed there. Perhaps in so doing we have missed our chance to nullify and root out the Communists altogether.

General Wessin was described as being objectionable to the United States because "he is so rigidly anti-Communist that he creates more Communists than he destroys." To me, this is a rather dogmatic assertion to make about one aspect of a problem described as one of the most complex ever tackled. But General Wessin was of the Dominican rightwing, and it was felt so urgent to get him out of the country that he was put aboard an American Air Force plane under the supervision of five armed FBI agents and a contingent of the 82d Airborne Division.

Now, at least in theory, it is the turn of the Dominican leftwing. But is it too late, and can the divide and conquer tactic succeed? A non-Latin diplomat, quoted in the September 27, 1965, issue of U.S. News & World Report, had a very gloomy view of the situation:

The Communists are stronger now than they ever have been in this country. They have come out in the open, publish their own newspaper, hold conventions, even call themselves Communist, openly. All the concessions are being made to the Communists—none to the other side. * * * Their gain is enormous. In one edition of *Patria* the Communists bragged in one statement that they were the power in the revolution. * * * In these months of revolution, the Communists have built up their political and military apparatus far beyond anything they ever had here before.

In the same magazine, a high-ranking Dominican military officer is quoted:

United States * * * seems to be protecting the Communists. * * * The Communists publish their newspapers—but the anti-Communists are ordered off the air. * * * We cannot understand your Government. You send thousands to fight communism in Vietnam—but give in to the Communists here.

We may well have allowed the Dominican Communists time to gain a foothold in this strategic Caribbean island republic and, in so doing, once again seized defeat from the jaws of victory. If there is a resultant loss of American prestige over the entire situation, it will not come from the fact that we did intervene to begin with. It will come from what we did not do when we had the chance. It will come from the loss of faith in U.S. determination to keep Communist influence out of the Western Hemisphere. This faith has already been badly shaken in Latin America by our actions at the Bay of Pigs in 1961 and the continued menace of Castro Cuba, and we will only have ourselves to blame if we are faced with more Cubas and more Dominican situations in the future.

Those in charge of conducting our foreign policy, in their attempts to make friends of our enemies, have managed to compile a rather sorry record of making enemies of our friends, without notice-

able success in their original endeavors. We sometimes act as if the supply of goodwill and respect for the United States in the world is not only inexhaustible but is also resilient enough to withstand whatever strains we choose to put upon it. Self-confidence in the conduct of a nation's foreign policy is an admirable and desirable trait, however, we can expect nothing but trouble ahead if it degenerates into self-deceit.

THE U.S. PAVILION AT THE WORLD'S FAIR

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege, along with my wife, last year, shortly after the opening of the World's Fair in New York to attend that fair, with a number of my colleagues and their families. The hospitality of the city was boundless indeed as usual. On returning to Washington after that wonderful and very fine weekend I, along with other Members of Congress, found it necessary to criticize the World's Fair itself for it was and is a good fair but the U.S. pavilion at that fair. At that time I was not critical of the building itself or its architecture which is terrific but I was critical of the subject matter, the treatment, and the handling of the history of the United States as portrayed then in that pavilion. It simply missed the mark.

It was my privilege again this year, for a brief while, to visit the World's Fair. I returned to the U.S. pavilion out of curiosity and I should like to say that the U.S. Commissioner to the World's Fair, Ambassador Norman E. Winston, along with his staff, are deserving of credit, because they have gone back into the history of the United States and have caused the pavilion to be completely redone so that it in truth and in fact tells in a very creditable manner the story of the United States in its growth and in world history. I am proud of that history and the manner in which it is now presented. I am sure all real Americans are. I think credit should be given where credit is due. Ambassador Winston, our U.S. Commissioner to the fair, and his staff, are deserving of credit. They have done a good job. The fair is a good one. I could not in good conscience let this great fair come to a close this week without recognizing that what I thought was a mistake has been indeed corrected.

AMBASSADOR NORMAN E. WINSTON AND THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR

(Mr. ROONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this brief time to commend the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] for his frankness and his fairness in regard to his visit this year to the New York

World's Fair and particularly the Federal pavilion therein. There is no question in my mind that the improvement this year in the Federal exhibit was wholly due to Ambassador Norman E. Winston, the Commissioner-General, my distinguished friend, and his staff. Ambassador Winston deserves great credit for the considerable time and attention he has given to his considerable duties.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SCHOOL DENIES ADMISSION TO NEGRO NONRESIDENT

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have previously informed the House that 22 States and the District of Columbia provide for a system of school tuition for nonresidents. At that time I mentioned that my research showed that Michigan has such a law.

On October 1, 1965, the Detroit News published an article indicating that a Georgia resident was prohibited from enrolling in a Michigan school. The school superintendent said that Michigan law forbade the admission of the 14-year-old Negro.

For the enlightenment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM] who has criticized our Mississippi law, I emphasize the fact that this incident occurred in Michigan—not in Mississippi.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the aforementioned article at this point:

[From the District News, Oct. 1, 1965]
CENTER LINE BLAMES LAW FOR BAN ON NEGRO PUPIL

(By Robert M. Pavich)

The superintendent of the all-white Center Line-Warren school district said today that State school laws, not racial prejudice prevented enrollment of a 14-year-old Negro boy from Georgia who had been invited to attend school here.

The boy, Matthew Hunter, was not enrolled and has returned to Georgia.

ADVISED OF LAW

In a resolution submitted to the State house of representatives at Lansing, nine Democratic legislators have called on Center Line officials to "search their souls and conscience" because they had "denied the hospitality of the North" to the Negro boy.

Clarence E. Crothers, superintendent of the suburban district, said that when he was approached by persons who wanted to enroll the boy in Center Line High School, he advised them that State law prohibited enrolling anyone from another district unless he were in the home of relatives in the district, in a licensed boarding home, or living with legal guardians in the district.

PETITION TO COURT

Matthew Hunter, who had been invited to the North by a Warren priest who became acquainted with him during a voter registration drive in the South could not qualify.

Crothers said he was informed on September 13, the day regular classes began at Center Line High, that the couple the Negro boy was staying with, Mr. and Mrs. George Fielder, had petitioned to probate court for a ruling that would allow them to be named guardians.

REFUSED TO RULE

Crothers said, "I assumed this would be authorized, so I informed the principal of

Center Line School who in turn informed his staff that the boy would be attending classes there.

"After this I heard nothing. The Fielders must have decided to send the boy home and the boy must have decided to go."

The probate court refused to rule on the petition by the Fielders, referring them instead to the State department of social welfare. That department said the matter was not in its jurisdiction.

Crothers said, "We had a colored child in our school system for nearly 2 years, from the spring of 1963 until the spring of 1965. We welcomed that child and her parents, who were involved in the local PTA.

"We have signed pledges with the Federal Government guaranteeing to enroll students without regard to race, color or creed. We have operated as such."

RIOTS IN WATTS, CALIF.

(Mr. YOUNGER (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I have read many editorials arising from the rioting in Watts, Calif. One of the best is the editorial broadcast over KMPC radio and KTLA channel 5 from Hollywood as M. B. Jackson's commentary. The editorial follows:

THE SECOND CIVIL WAR

One hundred years ago the Civil War ended and with it, the bloodiest episode in our country's history. Not many realize it, but the Civil War toll in dead and wounded was greater than that in all other wars in which we have been involved put together—including World War II and the Korean war.

In the past few days, Los Angeles has witnessed and been the victim of a state of anarchy and virtual civil insurrection probably unmatched since the last one.

To deny that it was racial in character or motivation—as some have attempted to do—would be like denying that slavery was an issue in the Civil War. It erupted in a depressed heavily Negro area, and has been fought and carried on by Negro mobs and gangs consisting of young and old alike. Slavery was a secondary issue in the Civil War. The preservation of the Union was the principal one. By the same token, the racial aspect of this second one is a secondary, albeit important, issue; the preservation of the fabric of our society and our type of government is the principal one here.

The consequences of last week's rioting sounds like a catalog of major crimes: riots, pillage, arson, looting, murder, aggravated assault, armed robbery, beatings, burglary—you name it. Scenes of fire and destruction remind one of London during the Battle of Britain—and they call to my mind many vivid combat scenes during the war in the Pacific.

The extraordinary thing is that this should have happened in California. This is not the Deep South. Los Angeles has an enviable record for good race relations among its citizens, and they are justifiably proud of it. It has its poorer sections—no large city is without them—but they are nothing compared to some of the slum areas in the large northern cities of this country—to say nothing of other large cities in the world.

Why did it happen here? What caused it? What is the answer; what is the cure?

As usual with anything as cataclysmic as this, there are no easy answers. This is a cliché in itself, I know. But many of the basic factors involved are not difficult to identify. The trouble is, however, that they are unpleasant to face, and people in positions of responsibility and leadership in the

community—National and State as well as local—frequently try to sidestep them or avoid coming directly to grips with them in the terms they require.

We might start off by eliminating a few sloopworn excuses that are invariably offered up when situations like this break out—and are beginning to be peddled about in this case. The first of these, and probably the most vicious, is that police brutality—that old bugaboo—is responsible for the whole mess. A few Eastern commentators have already played this tune. But it just doesn't play this time.

Los Angeles has probably the finest metropolitan police force in the country, if not the world—and I am familiar with many of them. Its record and efforts in the field of community and race relations is particularly noteworthy, and it is there on the record for anyone who is interested in facts to check. I made a point of this myself a year or so back and spoke not only with Chief Parker and several of his people, but also with several prominent members of the Negro community, including one who is now a member of the city council. At that time, complaints of police brutality were among the reasons cited by those who favored the creation of a police review board. When asked for examples of this, they invariably boiled down to complaints of "verbal brutality"—use of offensive language, or at least language offensive to Negro sensitivities. I was cited to not one example of actual physical brutality. Even this complaint was rife by a special training course given to police officers who were instructed in the niceties of language to be employed when dealing with Negroes, and particularly when handling Negro suspects.

Actually, no better evidence of the lack of police brutality is furnished than the very restraint with which our law enforcement officers have conducted themselves under conditions of extreme provocation during the last week.

On the contrary, what we have seen is heroic devotion to duty of police and fire department people—outnumbered and under constant, savage attack—in their attempt to restore law and order and to defend the safety and security, Mr. and Mrs. Citizen of Los Angeles, of you and of your property. Parenthetically, I frequently wonder how it is that those who get themselves so worked up over police brutality, so-called, can feel so little apparent corresponding concern over the brutality practiced on hundreds of innocent citizens by lawless mobs in the past few days.

The second cliché which is being offered up is that the Negro is simply reacting by giving vent to long pent-up frustration; that he has been held down and mistreated too long, and the inevitable reaction is setting in. One is given the impression that this has been the result of a deliberate, almost single-minded conspiracy on the part of the white community. The utterance comes as a sort of breastbeating, a mea culpa, and it is heard from white and Negro apologists alike, who, incredibly seem to justify and excuse, in their own minds, murder, arson, assault, armed robbery, and every other crime in the book by the mere fact of social maladjustment or economic underprivilege.

Again, this one does not play, because it does not square with the facts—nor does it face them.

The opinion makers in our society today—the journalists, writers, political leaders, etc., seem to have a preoccupation with sickness, social and physical. It is all they seem to be able to write or talk about. We see little else on television and the screen; we read of hardly anything else in books, magazines and all the other media. It is hardly fashionable anymore to be healthy or normal. However, to put this point into somewhat better focus, let us consider for the moment a different type of citizen from the one we

have heard so much about recently. He is the one you never hear of, and seldom hear from, but, contrary to the impression that might be gained from reading the papers, he represents the vast majority of the people in this country.

This citizen has educated himself—has taken advantage of the marvelous schools this country affords; he works for a living and supports himself and his family. He pays his taxes—and he doesn't complain too loudly over the fact that they are high and that a large part of them goes to pay the cost of maintaining programs for the relief of those who haven't gone at things the way he has. He is probably making payments on his own home, but the property taxes are getting so high that he wonders if he will be able to hang onto it. Welfare programs which soak up over half of this State's budget alone keep pushing them further and further up.

He pays his bills on time; and with what little is left over, he very likely contributes to various charities of his own choosing.

Our Mr. Citizen obeys the law. He may grumble at an occasional traffic ticket, but he has respect for the officer nevertheless. He probably uses his seat belt when he drives but, more importantly, he respects the rights of others on the highway. He supports and stays with his wife and children, and he is concerned to see that his children receive a good education, hopefully at the college level, so that they may do better in life than he has done. He probably belongs to his local PTA and very likely is a member of his community church.

The likelihood also is that he put in a weary and dangerous stint fighting for his country, and that his son may possibly be in Vietnam now, or at least available for the draft. Neither he nor his son relishes the idea, but they accept the obligation, and the son will discharge it with honor just as his father did.

This Mr. Citizen we have been talking about has a quality that is part of the root structure of our society—a sense of responsibility. He is a vital and accepted part of his community because of his contribution to it. This is the essence of his identity with it. He doesn't take or demand—he gives, contributes, in the best sense of our common Judeo-Christian tradition. As a consequence, he is respected.

It was precisely this sense of obligation, this notion of personal responsibility and this type of contribution to the community which gave rise to our Nation and gave it the character which has kept it stable and thriving for 200 years—a continuity which no nation in the Western world, with the possible exception of Great Britain, can claim.

You will notice that the Mr. Citizen I am talking about is not white, or black, or yellow, or red, because his qualities still characterize the vast majority of our countrymen, including the vast majority of our so-called minority communities—Negro, Jewish, Chinese, Japanese, Mexican, Polish, Italian, Irish, Scandinavian, or what-have-you.

These citizens contribute to their communities. And they ask only to be secure in the equal protection of the law which it is the Government's obligation to extend to them. They don't bother their neighbors; but they demand, and have a right to expect protection from injury by neighbors who would bother them.

These citizens stand out in startling contrast to those in that community which spawned the bath of fire and blood recently witnessed here: one where crime is rampant, where over 1,000 felonies have been logged in the last few months including 196 murders and other major crimes; with an illegitimacy rate of 25 percent or higher and a divorce rate of 33 percent or higher; an area containing at least 500 probationers from the commission of major crimes and a large proportion of whose population lives on relief.